

The SECRETARY. In lieu of Senate resolution 6 substitute the following:

Whereas the Senate adopted a resolution June 20, 1910, directing the Committee on Privileges and Elections to investigate the charges relating to the election of WILLIAM LORIMER to the Senate of the United States; and

Whereas since the Senate voted on the report of that committee it is represented that new material testimony has been discovered in reference to such matter; and

Whereas the Senate of the State of Illinois, on the 18th of May, 1911, adopted a resolution for the reasons therein stated, requesting the Senate of the United States to institute further investigation of the election of WILLIAM LORIMER to the Senate: It is therefore

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections, sitting in banc, be, and are hereby, authorized and directed forthwith to investigate whether in the election of WILLIAM LORIMER as a Senator of the United States from the State of Illinois there were used and employed corrupt methods and practices; that said committee be authorized to sit during the sessions of the Senate and during any recess of the Senate or of Congress; to hold sessions at such place or places as it shall deem most convenient for the purposes of the investigation; to employ stenographers, counsel, and accountants; to send for persons and papers; to administer oaths; and as early as practicable to report the results of its investigation, including all testimony taken by it; and that the expenses of the inquiry shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the committee. The committee is further and specially instructed to inquiry fully into and report upon the alleged "jack-pot" fund in its relation to and effect, if any, upon the election of WILLIAM LORIMER to the Senate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair supposes the Senator from Virginia claims the floor.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will wait until I can take the floor in my own right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia yield the floor?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I understood that the Senator from Wisconsin was of opinion that this matter could not be concluded this afternoon, and that he was going to make some suggestion in that regard. It is entirely immaterial to me. I am ready to go on, or I can wait.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not wish to take the Senator from Virginia from his feet.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I was not taken from my feet. I yielded to the Senator, understanding that he was going to make a suggestion of that sort.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understood that the Senator from Virginia yielded to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. With a view of making a motion, and I am about to make a motion, but I do not wish to make a motion to take the Senator from Virginia off the floor.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I understood the Senator wanted this matter to go over until Monday.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am satisfied it will not be possible to conclude argument upon the resolution to-night. I know of other Senators who desire to speak, and I myself shall have something to say. I am perfectly willing, if the Senator from Virginia desires to speak now, to withhold a motion to adjourn. I wish to accommodate the Senator.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I am perfectly willing that a motion to adjourn shall be made, but I should like to have it understood that I will resume the floor when this matter is taken up on Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is in the hands of the Chair, and of course the Chair would recognize the mover of the substitute.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I am perfectly willing, with that understanding, to yield the floor for to-day.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 29, 1911, at 2 o'clock p. m.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, May 26, 1911.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by Rev. William Alexander Major, D. D., of Seattle, Wash., as follows:

O Lord, our God, Thou who art the Spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable, in Thy being wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth, we look to Thee for all good. We are told that if a man lack wisdom, let him ask of God. We need Thy help, intelligence, instruction, discipline, growth.

Let Thy blessing fall upon these men who represent the greatest Government upon earth, help every man to be a good steward, faithful in the discharge of his duty, and may we all

live and act so that what we do may commend itself to all the nations of the world.

We thank Thee for what Thou hast done for the individual. We bless Thee for his place in the world. We thank Thee for what Thou hast stamped upon him, and we come to-day to recognize that every act and perfect gift cometh from Thy hand. Lead us now in the deliberations of the day, strengthen us for every duty which awaits us, and not unto us, O God, not unto us, but unto Thy name give glory, for Thy mercy and Thy truth's sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 23, 1911, was read and approved.

### SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. McKENZIE, of Illinois, appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 287. An act for the relief of James Henry Payne;

S. 288. An act to authorize the President to place Ensign John Tracey Edson on the retired list of the Navy with the rank of lieutenant;

S. 307. An act to change the name of Fort Place, from Seventeenth to Eighteenth Streets NE., to Irving Street;

S. 274. An act providing for the removal of snow and ice from the paved sidewalks of the District of Columbia; and

S. 2055. An act to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a new public building at Bangor, Me.; also for the sale of the site and ruins of the former post-office building.

### SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 287. An act for the relief of James Henry Payne; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 288. An act to authorize the President to place Ensign John Tracey Edson on the retired list of the Navy with the rank of lieutenant; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 307. An act to change the name of Fort Place, from Seventeenth to Eighteenth Streets NE., to Irving Street; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 274. An act providing for the removal of snow and ice from the paved sidewalks of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2055. An act to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a new public building at Bangor, Me.; also, for the sale of the site and ruins of the former post-office building; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

### LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to—

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia, for 10 days, beginning Monday, May 29, 1911, on account of important business.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH, for 14 days, on account of important business.

Mr. KENDALL, for two weeks, on account of important business.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota, for two weeks, on account of illness in family.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. BROUSSARD, desires 10 days leave of absence, on account of important business.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana asks leave of absence for his colleague, Mr. BROUSSARD, on account of important business. Without objection, this request will be granted.

There was no objection.

### WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—WILLIAM A. HARLAN.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted to Mr. CANNON to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of William A. Harlan, Fifty-ninth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

### WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—JOHN MITCHELL.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted to Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of John Mitchell, in the Sixty-first Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

By unanimous consent, reference of the bill (H. R. 10508) to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and

monopolies was changed from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### CALL OF COMMITTEES.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the committees.

When the Committee on Accounts was called,

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up House joint resolution No. 75, reported favorably from the Committee on Accounts, and ask for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia, by authority of the Committee on Accounts, calls up the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 75) reducing the number of Capitol police. *Resolved, etc.*, That the provisions in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation acts, approved June 7, 1910, and March 4, 1911, making appropriations for the Capitol police, are hereby amended by reducing the number of lieutenants from 3 to 2, by reducing the number of privates from 67 to 33, and by reducing the total appropriations for the Capitol police to such sums as may be necessary.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that this resolution should be on the Union Calendar and should be considered in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. I believe the rule is the same whether the purpose of the bill is to reduce expenditures or to increase expenditures. The purpose of this resolution is to discharge a certain number of employees and reduce the total of the appropriation. It is not a privileged report from the Committee on Accounts, where the money is to be paid out of the contingent fund, and does not come within the rule the Chair has heretofore made, that privileged resolutions from the Committee on Accounts involving expenditures out of the contingent fund are properly upon the House Calendar and do not require consideration in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that this resolution is not considered as a privileged resolution at all.

Mr. MANN. I understand it is not a privileged resolution and does not come within the ruling of the Chair. This is a joint resolution to amend an appropriation bill affecting the expenditures and providing for a reduction in the appropriation.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know if the gentleman will object to asking unanimous consent to consider this resolution in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes the gentleman would speak a little louder, inasmuch as it is a matter for the House to pass on.

Mr. MANN. I will not object.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I asked the gentleman from Illinois if he would object to a request for unanimous consent to consider this resolution in the House as in the Committee of the Whole, and he said he would not object, and I suggest the gentleman from Georgia make that request.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the resolution may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I shall not object, assuming if there is desired a little time for debate there will be no trouble about it.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. I will state to the gentleman there will be no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, this resolution completes, or is designed to complete, the caucus action of the majority on the 1st of April. On a previous day House resolution 128 was passed carrying into effect the recommendations of the caucus with the exception of the items carried by this resolution.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. I do.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I desire to ask whether there is to be general debate under a proceeding of this sort or whether the House does not at once proceed to the reading of the resolution and will offer it under the five-minute rule?

The SPEAKER. The resolution has been read once.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I understand; but it seems to me we now proceed under the five-minute rule, and there is no general debate allowed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman that on an interrogatory of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RODDENBERRY] promised there should be debate if they wanted any.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I understand that. I wanted to have the rule clearly understood. My impression is now that we are considering this resolution under the five-minute rule. Of course, we can consider it this way only by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The precedents show that there is no general debate when you are considering a resolution in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Then I understand that it is by agreement that we are under general debate?

The SPEAKER. That is true. There is a kind of tentative agreement between the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RODDENBERRY] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that if the gentleman from Illinois or anybody on that side wanted any time for debate they should have it. That was not put, however, as part of the motion.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I have no objection at all to the discussion.

The SPEAKER. According to the rule you are pursuing debate under the five-minute rule.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I think any difficulty in the matter can be obviated by any gentleman when he is recognized under the five-minute rule by asking for an extension of time, which will be granted.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RODDENBERRY] has the floor for the first five minutes.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the time of my colleague on the committee from Georgia be extended for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RODDENBERRY] be extended 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I do not apprehend that there will be any necessity for my consuming 15 minutes to present the report of the committee to the House. In addition to the favorable report on this resolution by the committee, a committee report has been filed with the resolution. It goes into the history of the creation of the Capitol police force and is for the information of the House, but, on account of its length, I shall merely incorporate the report as a part of my remarks and the House may examine it if they desire. The Members of the House will readily perceive that the Capitol police force is a joint force, a composite force, and under the existing law one-half of the police force is chosen by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and one-half by the Sergeant at Arms of the House. The caucus action and the report of the committee favor the abolition of 34 private policemen of the Capitol force and one lieutenant of Capitol police. And the joint resolution seeks to carry into effect this resolution by reducing the number of lieutenants from 3 to 2 and by reducing the number of privates from 67 to 33, which, if concurred in by the Senate, will give effective force to the action of the caucus and the recommendation of the Committee on Accounts, with a saving of approximately \$36,000. And we submit this resolution for the purpose of executing this mandate of the caucus.

Unless there is some question that a Member of the House would like to ask, if it is permissible under the motion to extend the time for 15 minutes, I will reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. I do.

Mr. WEEKS. I would like to know whether the practice is now to have a lieutenant on duty all the time.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. I am not able to answer the gentleman on that point. The rule seems to have been in the past to divide each 24 hours into 8-hour shifts, and under that theory three lieutenants might be necessary to make the systematic shifts of 8 hours each.

Mr. WEEKS. Necessarily, if the number of lieutenants were reduced, either the lieutenants would have to be on duty 12 hours each or else there would be one shift where there would not be an officer in charge of the force.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Yes, sir; if the captain did not take one of the shifts. The committee was not, however, able to see why the rule of an 8-hour shift should apply to a lieutenant with the same force that an 8-hour shift would apply to a private policeman, the duty of the policemen being of a char-



acter which might require an 8-hour shift, while that of the lieutenants is of another character—mainly supervisory—not requiring an 8-hour shift.

Mr. WEEKS. Does the gentleman think that it is desirable that the lieutenant shall remain on duty 12 hours?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. The gentleman will excuse me; I could not quite understand what he said.

Mr. WEEKS. My question was whether the gentleman thinks it desirable for a lieutenant or any other man to remain on duty continuously for 12 hours?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. If the captain serves 8 hours, there would be no interregnum or extra service to be performed by the lieutenants. But, speaking for myself, I think we might abolish the other two lieutenants and have a first-class captain and a reasonable police force and have no lieutenants at all. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The committee, however, did not feel authorized to undertake to abolish all three of the lieutenants, as it was acting in accordance with the recommendation of the caucus. The caucus probably thought they would abolish one of them first, and that in due course they would attend to the other two.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can not reserve his time under the five-minute rule. If the gentleman wants to take the floor again, nobody will object, but I do not want to see established the practice of reserving time under the five-minute rule.

Mr. Speaker, I am not informed as to the number of police necessary properly to police the Capitol, although I have no doubt whatever that there are more men employed than are necessary, and to that extent I am in sympathy in the main with the apparent purpose of this resolution. But I am not in sympathy with the real purpose of the resolution, which is merely buncombe. If there are too many policemen in the Capitol, there is an easy way of dispensing with half of them, who are under the control of this House. The police in the Capitol are named by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and the Sergeant at Arms of the House, and they are divided equally between the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and the Sergeant at Arms of the House, and the Sergeant at Arms of the House can at any time discharge one-half of them, and the House can on any day pass a resolution directing the Sergeant at Arms of the House to dispense with the services of one-half of the Capitol police. But everybody who has gray matter in his brain—and everyone on that side and on this side, both, has gray matter in his brain—knows that when this resolution passes the House it is as dead as a last year's smelt.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Or any other smelt.

Mr. MANN. It would be a ridiculous attitude for the Senate to assume if they were to agree to the passage of this resolution, when they, without responsibility having changed, have just passed a law providing for this specific number of policemen.

The gentlemen on that side of the House who say there are too many police under the control of this body ought by resolution to require that the extra number be discharged. They have it within their power. If they have too many police, dispense with them. You gentlemen on that side are endeavoring to make political capital simply by pretending that you want to dispense with these policemen, when you know that you really propose to keep every one of them and when you will fill every vacancy that is created.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MANN. I always yield with pleasure to my friend from Texas.

Mr. GARNER. I want to challenge the statement, Mr. Speaker, that we intend to keep them in office, and I want to ask the gentleman from Illinois if he will support a resolution dispensing with one-half of the number?

Mr. MANN. I will; certainly. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But will you bring it in? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GARNER. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Have them bring it in now.

Mr. GARNER. We will give the Senate a chance first.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman says he will bring it in. I am willing to dispense with half of the police, because that is the only way there is to ascertain if we have too many. But I do not think the Capitol would run away if we had only one-quarter of the policemen that we have now. In fact, I believe the Capitol would be here when we returned from a vacation if we did not have any police at all.

Mr. FOCHT (from his seat). Is there going to be any vacation? [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen desiring to participate in debate will rise and first secure recognition.

Mr. MANN. The question of the necessity of a vacation is such an admitted matter that I think it is perfectly natural for a Member to make an inquiry of that kind without rising from his seat. On that subject I refer the gentlemen on this side of the House to the gentlemen on that side of the House. [Laughter.]

I imagine that if we can keep the Weather Bureau in good order and the Chambers sufficiently hot at both ends of the Capitol, we may after awhile succeed in getting a vacation. Meanwhile, I hope the House will remain in session on those days when the new rule can operate which provides for the discharge of committees [applause on the Republican side], so that if we are obliged to stay in Washington we may be able to transact the business of the country, instead of merely loafing, as we are likely to for the next few days or few weeks. [Applause on the Republican side.] The gentleman thinks it is very important to pass a joint resolution to pretend to want to discharge half of the police of the Capitol. We think it is more important to pass a law providing for pensions for the old soldiers. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FINLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Illinois be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINLEY. Now, the gentleman from Illinois states that he thinks it is more important for the House to be in session and pass the pension bill that he speaks of. I ask the gentleman this question—I know that he is in a position to answer it—Why is it that the Republican Party in all the years that it was in power did not pass the bill the gentleman speaks of, and why did not the Republican Party pass that bill in the Sixty-first Congress?

Mr. MANN. Well, Mr. Speaker, this House did pass that bill in the Sixty-first Congress. Will this House pass it in the Sixty-second Congress?

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Let us do it, then. Let us not adjourn over the next committee-discharge day, and we can pass it quickly.

Mr. FINLEY. In the Sixty-first Congress was there not a Republican House, a Republican Senate, and a Republican President—

Mr. MANN. Yes; and there will be in the Sixty-third Congress also. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FINLEY. I think the gentleman is guessing as to the Sixty-third Congress. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But when power was in the hands of the Republican Party that bill was not passed.

Mr. MANN. That is true.

Mr. FINLEY. And now the gentleman comes around and cries for the old soldier and complains that Congress does not pass this bill; yet his own party in the Sixty-first Congress absolutely refused to do the very thing that he now asks this House to do. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. Yes, Mr. Speaker; and there was one time before when a resolution passed Congress providing for the discharge of Capitol police, but it contained the provision when it passed that it should not be construed to require or permit the discharge of any old soldier who was on the roll of the Capitol police. No such provision is in this joint resolution. Not content with having this House pass over committee-discharge day, one of your great original ideas which you were in favor of until you could put it into effect, not content with that, you now propose to say that you would like to discharge the old soldiers on the Capitol police roll.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. MANN. I do.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. I am glad to see the interest manifested by the gentleman from Illinois on pension legislation, and—

Mr. MANN. I am mighty glad the gentleman is.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio (continuing). I would like to ask you a question. As you know, I have a motion on the calendar to discharge the committee from further consideration of H. R. 767, a bill to increase the pensions of old soldiers and their widows, and am anxious to have the motion considered, but suppose the House will adjourn, when it adjourns to-day, to next Tuesday, and the question is, under the rule, would my motion be in order next Monday? You understand next



Monday will not be the first or third Monday, which days are motion-to-discharge-calendar Mondays.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman's motion would be in order on the first Monday in June, if there were a session of the House, but as there will be no session of the House, under the leadership of the gentleman on that side of the House, on the first Monday in June the gentleman's motion will not be in order, because it can only be in order when the House is in session.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. It will be in order on the third Monday in June, will it not?

Mr. MANN. Well, I expect not. [Laughter.] I do not think it will be in session on either the first or the third Monday of any month before December, and I am not sure it will be even then.

Mr. SIMS. For which the gentleman from Illinois is duly thankful in his heart. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, along this same line I wish to have read in my time a very pathetic appeal which has been addressed to the Members of the House, or, at least, to the majority Members of the House, by a gentleman who has apparently been the statistician of the Democratic national committee, a member of the force of employees of the House, whose job has been legislated out of existence. In order that the pathetic appeal may live in history, I desire to have it read and placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an able effort; and if it does not bring tears to the eyes of gentlemen on that side of the House, and sympathy as well, they are a cold-blooded lot. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARNER. Has it brought tears to the eyes of the gentleman from Illinois? [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE,  
821 FIFTEENTH STREET NW.,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: The caucus abolished the position of pair clerk. Both Mr. PALMER and Mr. HULL say they had no idea that this would abolish me, yet it has so worked. My place dies on May 15, as per resolution adopted Tuesday. Is this just to an employee who has always been at his post? Is it fair? Is it just to injure a faithful employee under the shibboleth of economy? Did a single man who voted to abolish the pair clerk's place have in his mind when so doing that it abolished me? More than 100 Members have told me that they never dreamed that my position was imperiled. Yet events have so twisted about that the full weight of the blow falls on my shoulders. Does economy outweigh the demands of justice?

I call every Member of the House to witness that I have always stood by my post and done valiant service for a much less compensation than the service warranted. I never complained at the pay and never asked for a better place, although I had a right so to do. I simply asked to be retained where I was, and common justice will move every man of you to say that I ought to have been retained.

You won a great victory in 1910. Was I not a contributor in 1909 to that victory, when, as clerk to the minority of the Ways and Means, I gave the party figures which were used on the floor of the House and on every stump in the country? Was I not a real contributor in 1910, when, as statistician for your committee, I furnished facts, figures, information, and arguments, which were used as weapons to strike a common enemy to the ground? Flushed and elate with victory, is it fair or just to me not only not to advance me but with fell hand to strike down the modest position I hold?

When a common defeat comes I am as ready to wear the willow un-murmuringly as any man living; but when a common victory, one to which I contributed a full share, without regard to section or district, comes to our banner I have a just right to the laurels, especially when my ambition leaps no higher than my old \$1,800 place. Having shared the dangers, it is not too much to ask a very small share of the honors. I have stood in no man's way nor coveted any man's place. I was satisfied where I was, and a great party can hardly afford to punish its honest workers by abolishing their positions. My place was not a sinecure, and besides filling it well I did work for the entire Congress which should have made my place immune from attack on any ground. Believing that a wrong has been done by Democrats without in the least intending it, I write this letter to each of the 226 victors with the hope that they will with pleasure and unanimity undo the wrong they have so unconsciously done a vigorous, enthusiastic, and vigilant member of their force. As the matter now stands, the Republicans have two pair clerks and the Democrats one. Is a Democrat's place so absolutely useless as to be abolished, while Republican places are impregnable?

I appeal to you, one and all, for an immediate reinstatement of my place, so that my opportunity for helpfulness in a common cause may not be ruthlessly destroyed.

As ever, your friend and coworker,

JOSIAH H. SHINN.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, that sounds like the plea of a lost soul. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLAYTON. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. CLAYTON. In view of the sympathy expressed by the gentleman from Illinois for Mr. Shinn—and I share in that sympathy—I have no sympathy for the employee by the name of Joseph Weir. Therefore I ask the gentleman from Illinois if he will agree to a resolution to dispense with the services of Mr. Weir and substitute Mr. Shinn in his place?

Mr. MANN. I do not know Mr. Weir, and neither do I know Mr. Shinn. I do not know what jurisdiction I have over a resolution in reference to employees.

Mr. CLAYTON. The gentleman is the leader of the minority.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman from Alabama desire that Mr. Shinn should be put in as a minority employee?

Mr. CLAYTON. I thought the sympathy the gentleman from Illinois expressed for him would lead him to put him in that place. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CLAYTON. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the time of the gentleman from Illinois be extended five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CLAYTON. I want to see if we can not reach a common point of agreement about this matter. I think the gentleman, Mr. Shinn, was unjustly turfed out, and the gentleman from Illinois thinks so, too. So we agree. The majority of the House, it seems, has but one pair clerk and the minority has two; so I think the fair and right thing, in view of the valuable service that Mr. Shinn has rendered, would be to dispense with the new man by the name of Weir and put Mr. Shinn in. What I desire to get at is an expression from the gentleman from Illinois, as minority leader, to see if he would agree with me in that; and then, if he will, I will devote myself to framing a proper resolution having that end in view.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the inquiry is a fair one. The gentleman, Mr. Weir, is, I believe, one of the minority pair clerks and a very efficient one, one that we have need for and use. The reasons given by the gentleman, Mr. Shinn, whose letter was read, for being employed by the House, is that he has been of great assistance and furnished the brains for the minority members of the Ways and Means Committee in the last Congress and very largely for the Democratic national committee. That may be a very good reason for his applying for the place in the House, although it does not appeal to me, but certainly it is not a very good reason for his being employed as a Republican minority employee of the House. [Laughter.] Perhaps he could change his party as rapidly as he could his position, but I do him the credit to say that I believe he was sincere and is a sincere man, who did good service in the House while he was employed under a Republican House. Whether he be re-employed or not, shortly some one else will be named by the Democratic House to fill his position, in order to properly take care of the work of the House.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, the debate has taken a range entirely foreign to the resolution, and I desire to call the attention of the House to one subject to which we did not allude.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will suggest to the gentleman from Georgia that he has no right to address the House again until everybody who wishes has spoken under the rule.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I understood that I reserved the remainder of the 15 minutes' time.

The SPEAKER. The difficulty about that is that one can not in Committee of the Whole or in the House when the House is proceeding as in Committee of the Whole reserve time.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to proceed for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, merely for this purpose do I rise: The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] called the attention of the House to a fact, or made a statement, that may be true, and that is that this joint resolution undertaking to abolish 34 private Capitol police and 1 lieutenant may never get any further toward actual passage than this end of the Capitol. The gentleman may be correct. However, it is the opinion of the majority—certainly of the Committee on Accounts—that before the House by simple resolution, or before the Sergeant at Arms of the House should assert or exercise the authority, if he has it, of his own will, to dismiss certain of the Capitol police force, this end of the legislative machinery should first pass by appropriate legislation, in the shape of a joint resolution, a proposition providing for a reduction of the number of the Capitol police force, with the concurrence of the Senate, inasmuch as the Capitol police force has always been a composite body. There has heretofore been no House police force and no Senate police force, but a Capitol police force, and so provided by existing law. Speaking for myself, and I believe for the committee, we will not controvert the proposition that the House by simple resolution could abolish 34 po-



lice by instructing the Sergeant at Arms not to appoint his quota—to wit, 34—but in that event we would have a police force of 34 which would be all nominated and selected by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate. Before that course, as a matter of economy, is resorted to, we think we are clearly within the purposes of the action of the caucus in submitting to the House a joint resolution and transmitting it to the Senate. It is a breach of no confidence that there is already a report on file upon the minutes of the Committee on Accounts recommending that if this resolution should meet with disaster at the hands of the Republican majority in the other end of the Capitol, we then forthwith report a resolution dismissing one-half of the police employed in the House end of the Capitol, which will give the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] one chance to vote for genuine and speedy economy. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I am not anxious to have unnecessary employees, our friends the Democrats being in the majority, and I was never anxious to have unnecessary employees when the Republicans were in the majority. I had never thought that the employees about the Capitol, especially the Capitol police, in connection with the grounds and Capitol, were too many. You gentlemen are responsible—discharge them all if you choose, or discharge a part of them if you choose—do your part of the legislating if you choose. Unfortunately, however, you may be blocked, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] says, by an unwilling Senate, because, after all, under the Constitution of the United States the Senate has to unite before legislation can be enacted. I have sometimes thought that this touching of the employees of the House and Senate was uncomfortable, because for many years, as I recollect, the employees in the Senate, a body numbering 92 Members, have been and are in excess of the employees of the House, a body numbering 391 Members. Oh, Mr. Speaker, I have assisted in tearing passion to tatters in denouncing that situation. If gentlemen doubt the correctness of my statement, let them just inquire and see the number of secretaries and the number of committees and committee clerks and the number of messengers and the number of janitors that the coordinate branch of the Government, called the Senate, has. After all, for 20 years this claim has been made, that either they have far too many or we too few. I expect there is a happy medium. Did any of you gentlemen ever make a vote out in Texas or anywhere else by holding up to public notice the extravagance of the Senate? Oh, no. But, Mr. Speaker, it is a nice diversion. Now, what we ought to have in this Capitol is enough employees to care for the Capitol and to care for the grounds.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, one would infer from the gentleman's remarks that because the Senate had an excess of employees over the number employed in the House that the House ought to continue the present number—

Mr. CANNON. Oh—

Mr. GARNER. Just one moment. Surely the gentleman does not contend that if it is shown that the employees in the House are unnecessary they ought to be retained?

Mr. CANNON. Why, absolutely not; but I wanted to show that you are, as I believe you are, masquerading before the country watching the drippings that drop here and drop there from the spigot; a little later on you will waste at the bung.

Why, discharge them all, if you want to do so. I can get along; but with the people coming to the Capitol, from the 90,000,000 of them, with all kinds of people, I do not know—I never was afraid of being assassinated when I was Speaker of the House, the present occupant of the Chair is not afraid of being assassinated, but unless they have forgotten their cunning the letters are many that the Speaker is receiving that his days are numbered, and for you to make your peace with God, Mr. Speaker. [Laughter and applause.] That is unavoidable. Once in awhile there comes a real crank or criminal, yet I never lost any sleep on that account or had a guard. If it was foreordained from the beginning that the Speaker of the House should be assassinated, nothing would stop it; yet there come into the galleries in the main many people, and once in awhile a crank or an insane man will possibly get in.

So much for that. Now, I am making no argument to affect your action in the premises, and having said that much about it, I might add that I have a room. We all have rooms. I think I am responsible more than any man living for the two Office Buildings. I had the honor and pleasure, along the line of the public service, by unanimous consent, of putting the provision in the sundry civil bill when I was chairman of the Committee on Appropriations authorizing the two Office Buildings. There

has been much of criticism about it, but I think no man criticizes now. Up to this time, however—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to have a few minutes more if I may—5 or 10 minutes—I do not think I shall use 10 minutes.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes additional.

Mr. CANNON. I think I will not take 10 minutes—

Mr. GARNER. I ask that the gentleman may be granted 10 minutes additional.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection, and the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 10 minutes additional.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I have been treated with great courtesy always as a Member of this House and have tried to treat others with courtesy. Now, I expect you have too many janitors, but I do not know; there is none for my room. [Laughter.] I can get along without a janitor or without anybody to sit at the door of the room and wait. After all, in a Government, the greatest on earth, that expends \$900,000,000 a year for the public service, and we make the appropriations and do the legislating, the query I want to suggest is, Had not we better seek to go to larger things than to deprive ourselves of the ordinary assistance for the performing of our duties because we have great responsibilities? That is all. I will get along and I guess you will get along. So much for that. Now a word touching the discharge of committees. Something has been said about it.

The rule being in the rules, and there being a calendar of that kind, it had just as well not be there unless we use it; but I find that the majority, after a caucus, as I understand it, say that we shall not use it. Well, all I want is for the country to understand, because I believe in the rule of the majority. This is a Government of the people through a majority, the majority being responsible. You might just as well not have adopted the rule unless you are going to use it. Are you afraid to use it? Will it embarrass somebody? I fancy so. Let me go a little bit into some of the happenings. I have in my mind's eye some Members in the Sixty-first Congress on the minority side. I have some letters written by some of those Members—I will not mention their names unless they want me to do so [laughter]—to their constituents informing them that the pension legislation for the veterans of the Civil War—a dollar a day—could not be considered by the House because an autocratic czar—the Speaker—had so decreed.

There is no autocratic czar now in the Speaker's chair. You have nearly 65 majority in the House. Oh, my dear friends from Ohio, how you came over into Illinois demanding a dollar-a-day pension, and how I was grilled because, as an autocratic Speaker, I put my autocratic foot upon that legislation. And, say, I have some of you in my mind's eye, and some of you in my eye right now. [Laughter and applause.] And now the query is, What are you going to do? Were you deceiving the people then, or are you going back upon your promise now?

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. CANNON. I do.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. The gentleman mentioned some Members, particularly from Ohio. I hope he does not refer to the gentleman from the thirteenth district.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Is the gentleman very particularly interested at this day on account of his desire to get up the pension bill and let it become a law?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman will receive a full, frank, earnest, and truthful reply. Recognition was given on suspension day in the last session of Congress to move to suspend the rules and pass what was known as the "Suloway bill." I never demagogued in my life touching pension legislation, and I believe I have not demagogued touching any legislation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. CANNON. I want to answer this first, but a little later I will yield. Oh, the gentleman said we had a Republican Senate, and they did not pass it. We passed it here, and I, for the



second time while I was Speaker during eight years, took five minutes to advocate that legislation, and it passed by a two-thirds vote through the House. Everybody understands that the Senate has no cloture, no previous question, and it could not be reached and was not reached. I want to put it up to the Senate. You say that it is a Republican Senate, but it does not seem to be able to elect Senator GALLINGER President pro tempore of the Senate. But if it is a Republican Senate, let us put up this legislation to it. I appeal to the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions. I appeal to the Ohio Members. I appeal to the Indiana Members that tore passion to tatters with speeches along this line. Gentlemen, I do not say that you intended to deceive, but I will say that you intended to deceive unless you call another Democratic caucus and rescind that resolution that I understood you adopted, to the effect that there should be no pension legislation at this session.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to correct the gentleman's impression.

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. I want to correct the gentleman's impression as to what the Democratic caucus did, if I may. You understand as well as I do that the program did not consider pension legislation; but I understood we would be called together several times, and at the next caucus I expected to ask for pension legislation. There was no statement made at the caucus that we would not have pension legislation at the special session, and my candid opinion is that we will have pension legislation at this session of Congress, at least I expect to do everything I can to get legislation that will do justice to the old soldier and his widow.

Mr. CANNON. That is all right. If you are going to do it, then my remarks do not amount to anything. It reminds me of a boy that I once met when I was in a campaign. I stayed a night with a farmer. He had a beautiful farm, and we were looking over it the next morning, and finally I said to him, "I have got a farm down in Vermillion County; come down and see me and we will go out and look it over; bring this boy and bring the wife." And I said, "I have got a pony that I will give to this boy." The boy began to pull at the father's coat-tail. Finally the father said to him, "What is it, Chan?" The boy replied, "Father, ask the gentleman when." [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. COX of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CANNON. I will.

Mr. COX of Indiana. The gentleman was appealing a moment ago to the Indiana delegation in regard to the pension question. I want to put this inquiry to the gentleman, if he will permit, whether or not he thinks his own party in Indiana was trying to deceive the people when it, in State convention, solemnly declared for a dollar-a-day pension bill?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, my party, I think, was in good faith. I know I am in good faith, and I know that the Republican House of Representatives of the Sixty-first Congress was in good faith. But all this is "leather and prunella." You have got your 65 majority. Are you going to perform? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. COX of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. WILLIS. Do it now. [Laughter.]

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. When? [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. CANNON. Now, that is all I desire to say. You are entitled to time for consideration. That is all right, but—

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. CANNON. With great pleasure.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wanted very respectfully to ask my good friend from Illinois a question, being of the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. CANNON. With pleasure; all right.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have a pleasant recollection now of the fact that the gentleman from Illinois placed me upon that committee in the Sixtieth Congress.

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. As a member of that committee I want to say now that I personally am in favor of pension legislation as early as possible at this session of Congress, if practical, or as soon as it can be had, so that it is not with a view of opposing legislation at this session that I ask this question.

Mr. CANNON. But I will say to the gentleman, before he asks his question, "Next!" [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Is there anybody else who wants to be excused on that side? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. RUSSELL. My friend from Illinois seems to desire to make the impression that the Democratic Congress is opposed to pension legislation.

Mr. CANNON. Not at all.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will ask him to state if it is not a fact that in the Sixty-first Congress there was an extra session at which there was no effort made to enact pension legislation?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; I think so.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. May I have a minute more?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for another minute. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Illinois will proceed by unanimous consent.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would like to ask the gentleman whether there has ever been a pension bill passed or even considered by a Republican Congress at an extra session?

Mr. CANNON. I do not recollect. But you are the reformers. You have come in with all kinds of pledges, and you have promised that you were going to be better than we Republicans were. It makes no difference whether it is an extra or special session or not. If we failed in our duty at a special session, is that any reason why you should fail in your duty?

Mr. RUSSELL. We are not going to fail in our duty. If a bill is not passed at this session, as I am personally in favor of having it passed, we propose to pass it at the regular session, when we will still have a majority of this House.

Mr. GARNER. Does the gentleman from Illinois think the passage of a pension bill that will increase the expenses of the Government \$50,000,000 a year a reform measure?

Mr. CANNON. I believe in it from the standpoint of public policy. As we rely upon the citizen soldiery for the defense of the great Republic of 90,000,000 of people for the future, I believe it is good policy. I am old enough to know what those men passed through in that great struggle, and I would pass the bill. If you gentlemen will stop tinkering with the revenue laws, I believe we shall have enough money to pay the expense. But if you keep on tinkering, I would still pass the bill, and, if necessary, to discharge this great obligation I would borrow the money. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. FERRIS. I wanted to ask the gentleman from Illinois if the Republican President who called this session included the pension legislation in his call or recommended it?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, as to Oklahoma, God knows what that Oklahoma constitution does provide; I do not. There is the initiative and the referendum. I do not know precisely whether the gentleman's State has the recall, but I know that down there there are all kinds of chances to legislate. It may be that that constitution of Oklahoma prohibits a legislature called in special session from considering anything not included in the call; but we are operating under the Constitution of the United States, and the President did not put anything in his message touching the free-trade tariff bill, or a revision of Schedule K, or the cotton schedule. Under our Constitution we have plenary power to cover the whole legislative field. I trust I have given my friend from Oklahoma something of information touching the United States. We are not governed by the constitution of Oklahoma. [Laughter.]

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, during the last session of Congress it was rumored that the President would veto the Sulloway bill, a bill drafted along the same lines as my bill. Now, I should like to know if the gentleman from Illinois is aware of the fact, or if it is a fact, that the President will sign the bill, providing the Democratic Party passes it, as I think they will?

Mr. CANNON. Let me say to my friend the President is President. So far as the veto power is concerned and his power to communicate with Congress with recommendations for legislation, the gentleman is as familiar with it as I am. I will perform my duty here and the President can perform his duty there. He has not directed my action, and can not. I have not directed his action, and can not. God forbid that we should ever race along the lines where one coordinate branch of this Government interferes with another. [Applause.]

Now, as to whether he would have vetoed it or not, I do not know. He never asked me, and we never talked along that line. The newspapers say that he never said he would veto it. I will vote with you to pass it and send it to him, and then I believe



he will perform his duty as God gives him to see the right. [Applause.] I think it is right to pass the legislation. Now, that is all I have to say.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have been referred to by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. I will say to the gentleman that my reference was not at all personal.

Mr. SHERWOOD. The gentleman was looking right at me, and I supposed he referred to me.

Mr. CANNON. I referred to the gentleman as chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. SHERWOOD. I greatly admire the gentleman's new-born zeal for the old soldier.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, it is not new born.

Mr. SHERWOOD. It was born in the November election of 1910. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I am the author of the dollar-a-day pension bill, introduced in this House in December, 1907, and reintroduced in the next Congress. I never was able to get a vote, even, in the Invalid Pensions Committee of the House, controlled by the Republican Party. They would not even give me a vote on the question.

On the 26th of February, 1908, I made a speech on the floor of this House in favor of the dollar-a-day pension bill and exhibited at that time the greatest array of petitions in favor of that bill that were ever seen on the floor of this House; and while I was delivering that speech the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] called attention to the fact that the Republicans on that side of the House, with the exception of only six, had left the Hall. I want to show by the RECORD how much the gentleman from Illinois was in favor of the dollar-a-day pension bill when he was Speaker of this House.

On April 24, 1910, Representative Charles Weiss, of Wisconsin, a member of the Invalid Pensions Committee, well known to all the Members of this House, came into my office, No. 175 House Office Building, and in the presence of two witnesses made this statement:

You can quote me as saying, Chairman SULLOWAY told me that he would not allow the Sherwood dollar-a-day bill to come out of the committee, as Mr. CANNON and the administration would not stand for it; that they would prevent a vote by keeping enough members of the committee away from each meeting to prevent a quorum.

This was on April 24, 1910.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. SHERWOOD. Let me get through with my remarks. I did not interrupt the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. Just upon that point. The gentleman there quotes a double hearsay and brings it as evidence, and I, looking in his eye, tell him there is not a word of truth in it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SHERWOOD. You were Speaker of this House and absolutely in control. You had a Republican committee. Why did you not report the bill?

Mr. CANNON. I was not a member of that committee then and am not now. You are its chairman. Why do you not report the bill? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SHERWOOD. The dollar-a-day pension bill has been considered and approved. It was adopted as the platform of the Democratic Party of Ohio. The Republican Party of Ohio in convention assembled denounced that as demagoguery. Gov. Harmon was elected governor of Ohio by 100,000 majority and over on that bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

We have prepared a bill and the committee has agreed to a bill and at a future day it will report a bill which will be passed by this Congress, and you will vote for it. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] The reason it has not been reported is that we have not had a chance to report it. It seems to me it is an exhibition of remarkable amount of gall for a man who has been Speaker of the House of Representatives during all this time, who would not allow a pension bill to come out of a committee for over four years, to complain that no bill has been reported at an extra session when no bill has ever been passed at an extra session. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I want to call attention to the fact and ask the gentleman how long the Senate committee had the Sulloway bill before it reported it? The bill was passed by the House on the 10th of January, and the Senate held it for 53 days in committee, clearly intending to smother it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman's time be extended.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire a further extension of time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. SHERLEY. I demand the regular order.

Mr. CANNON. That is the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last word, and that is the regular order.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman from Illinois will have to speak to the matter before the House.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kentucky was not in the Hall of the House when we commenced this afternoon, I understand.

Mr. SHERLEY. That statement is true. I was not here when the House met, but I was here very shortly after.

Mr. MANN. This is a resolution that should have been considered in Committee of the Whole, and I think there was no intention of being strict about the rules of debate. I simply want to call that to the gentleman's attention.

Mr. SHERLEY. I merely exercised my right in demanding the regular order.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has the right; but I want to say that if that right be exercised freely on that side of the House, the same right will be exercised on this side of the House. The other day the gentleman from Kentucky got 15 minutes by consent of the House to speak on a question that was not before the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I believe this House ought to be properly equipped by appropriations providing for officials that will enable the House to properly legislate for the consideration of the House. There is much of important legislation that the country expects will be considered and hopes that it may be enacted. This is a large country, with larger revenues than any country on earth and larger expenditures than any country on earth. It requires much of diligence and much of industry. I especially desire to call attention to the great number of important bills touching interstate and foreign commerce that have been referred to the proper committee. There has been much of criticism heretofore touching legislation that has been referred to that committee that was promised to be considered if there should be a change in the complexion of the House. I say that also with regard to many other important measures and important committees—the Ways and Means Committee, for instance. So it is with another important committee. Much of criticism for alleged failure to enact proper pension legislation has been had.

I will not stop to discuss—and perchance under a strict construction it might not be in order—the merits of that criticism, but I do desire to say, without discussing it, without excusing or without accusing, the House should be properly equipped with vigilant committees to consider this important business before the Ways and Means Committee, before the Appropriations Committee, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and before the Committee on Invalid Pensions. The country does not care three whoops about what legislation has not been enacted; it is a question of what shall be enacted. The chairmen of these great committees can not excuse themselves from failure to report proposed legislation that will enable the House to consider the same. Mr. Speaker, I believe I have been strictly in order. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

*Resolved, etc., That the provisions in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation acts, approved June 17, 1910, and March 4, 1911, making appropriations for the Capitol police, are hereby amended by reducing the number of lieutenants from 3 to 2, by reducing the number of privates from 67 to 33, and by reducing the total appropriations for the Capitol police to such sums as may be necessary.*

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the period at the end of line 10 and insert in lieu thereof a comma and add the following:

*"Provided, That in carrying out the provisions of this resolution preference in the matter of reduction of said force shall be given to honorably discharged soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and of the War with Spain."*

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make only a few remarks in support of this amendment. This debate has taken a wider range perhaps than the rules strictly construed would permit, and inasmuch as that has occurred I shall venture to say a few words which will not relate directly to the merits of the amendment. I want to say in answer to the statement made



by some gentleman that the President of the United States might have vetoed the Sulloway bill if it had passed the Senate, that in my judgment he would not have done so. Furthermore, no Republican President ever did veto a pension bill, public or private, and no Republican President, in my judgment, ever will veto a pension bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I have heard President Taft on more than one occasion utter the most friendly and patriotic sentiments in favor of liberal pension legislation, and I do not think I violate any confidence when I say that only yesterday the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, Gen. SHERWOOD, and myself had a talk with him, in which he expressed his earnest desire for liberal pension legislation for the relief of soldiers who have jeopardized their lives or their health in the service of this country. And I say to you, gentlemen, that he is the soldier's friend, and will approve any reasonable pension bill that comes to him.

As a member of the Committee on Invalid Pensions I want to say that I am anxious to see a more liberal pension law enacted, and I am doing all I can to that end, and I believe my colleagues on the committee are also. I hope it will be done at this extra session. I think such legislation has already been too long delayed. I shall not stop to say whether or not my own party has been derelict in that respect, but let me say to gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber that if they will take up and pass such a bill I, as a Republican, will heartily support it even if it is a Democratic measure, and I will give you your full share of the credit for aiding in the enactment of such a law. I want to see the law passed while the old boys are still living to enjoy it, I care not who gets the credit.

With reference to this amendment, I do not know whether I am personally acquainted with a single member of this Capitol police force or not, but I have no doubt there are some ex-soldiers of the Civil War and some ex-soldiers of the Spanish War among them, and if such there be I want to see them given this preference in the matter of retention which the general law now gives to the soldier employees of the Government in the classified branches of the service. I hope the amendment will prevail. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, as far as the Committee on Accounts is concerned, if I understand the amendment as it was read, we have no objection to its being adopted. Therefore I ask to have the amendment read that we may fully understand what it is.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make an inquiry of the gentleman from Georgia, if he has the information, or the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD], as to how many new men have been appointed, or how many men have been appointed anew, on the police force since the officers of the House were elected—named by the Sergeant at Arms of the House?

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, nearly all of the 17 that would remain on the House side have been named. Some of them have been actually appointed. Others have not yet been appointed.

Mr. MANN. As I understand, there have been a number of policemen appointed through the Sergeant at Arms of the House since the present Sergeant at Arms was elected.

Mr. LLOYD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I should have supposed if there were vacancies they would leave them vacant, if there is really no use for the policemen.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, we have not filled any vacancies. We have simply made vacancies and filled those with Democrats.

Mr. MANN. Oh, the gentleman has filled vacancies because he has made vacancies. He could have made vacancies and left the vacancies unfilled; and if there is no need for the policemen, why in the world does he not make the vacancies and leave them for the present? If you do not need the men, why should you have them and waste public money paying them?

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, the 17 remaining places will be filled by Democrats. The patronage committee, or the organization committee, if I may so call it, which is a caucus committee of the Democratic Party, have no power to dismiss anybody. They have followed as strictly as they knew how the suggestions of the Democratic caucus, and that Democratic caucus said that 17 policemen should be had, and we expect to have 17 policemen appointed.

Mr. MANN. Then, as I understand it, the gentleman proposes to name 17 Democrats for useless places that are not needed, it being stated that there is no occasion for these policemen, in the opinion of the other side of the aisle—no demand for them; no need for them. They still propose to appoint 17

men to those places at a salary of \$1,100 a year—a gross waste of the money if gentlemen are correct. Now—

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. The useless places are held by Republicans, who will be discharged—

Mr. MANN. Ah, the gentleman says—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield to his colleague?

Mr. MANN. I do.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was going to say the 17 useless places are now held by Republicans, who will be discharged when this resolution goes into effect.

Mr. MANN. Ah, but this resolution says there are 34 useless places. Do I understand my colleague from Illinois to say that a place is useless unless it is to be filled by a Democrat, and if it is to be filled by a Democrat, then it is useful? I can understand that these places are useful to gentlemen on the committee on patronage—is the gentleman on the committee on patronage? Yes; and my colleague thinks the places are useful because they are obliged to find places in order to satisfy the cormorant demands of that side of the House—

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. MANN. And they say in one breath they have no need for them and in the next they say that they do need the places, and hence it is proposed to appoint men to the job.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to address myself to the amendment for just a moment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, the provision contained in the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky extends a preference to the soldiers of the Civil War and the Spanish War, and the chairman of the Committee on Accounts, from whose action I can not dissent, has expressed the view that that committee will accept the amendment, but before the House votes upon it I desire to suggest that the expressed preference now designed by the amendment in favor of the Civil War veterans comes at a late hour from that side of the House, when for 16 years, and since the Spanish War, you have been filling those places, and your resolutions made no such provision for the Civil War veterans. [Applause on the Democratic side.] More than that, I would ask you now why in 1898, when 18 of these Capitol police were put on under the exigencies of the Spanish-American War and the places were filled, you did not give them to old soldiers, and why old soldiers do not fill them now?

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. I do.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would call the gentleman's attention to the fact that when the Republicans are administering the law it does not require a resolution for them to keep soldiers on the roll. They do it anyhow. [Applause on the Republican side.] Some of them were appointed, I am told, on this police force when the Republicans had control of it. Let me call the gentleman's attention also to the fact that the Republicans have enacted into the statute law of the country provisions giving preference in all branches of the public service to the ex-soldiers and ex-sailors of the country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. RODDENBERRY. I am glad of the gentleman's statement. If they pursued that policy, then go to the Post Office Department, go to the War Department, go, if you please, into the Treasury Department and see sitting at the desks there, standing at the doors, and filling the places able-bodied, sleek-faced, strong Africans holding easy jobs which old, enfeebled veterans deserve. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Why give to these old, feeble men who fought 50 years ago the arduous task of night police duty and day police duty? Why do you not give them some of these sitting-down jobs? [Applause on the Democratic side.] Speaking as a son of the South, with no lineage that connects me with those who led the Union side 50 years ago, the day is not now and never has been south of Mason and Dixon's line when Afric's son could displace a Caucasian in any office under any Democratic appointment. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You can no longer deceive the old soldiers or American people with your cunning demagoguery in order to control the southern vote in your Republican conventions.

We had accepted the amendment; and we would have carried out the purposes anyway, if it had never been in the bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].



The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the amended House joint resolution.

The joint resolution was engrossed and read a third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

#### UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I offer from the Committee on Accounts the following privileged resolution, with certain committee amendments, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to be adopted:

House resolution 173 (H. Rept. 40).

*Resolved*, That all expenses that may be incurred by the committee appointed under the resolution of the House of Representatives adopted May 16, 1911, to make an investigation for the purpose of ascertaining whether there have occurred violations by the United States Steel Corporation or other corporations or persons of the antitrust act of July 2, 1890, and the acts supplementary thereto, the various interstate-commerce acts and the acts relative to the national-banking associations, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives on vouchers approved by the chairman of said committee.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 10, after the word "associations," insert "to an amount not exceeding \$25,000."

In line 12 strike out the words "approved by the chairman of said committee" and insert "ordered by said committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on Accounts, evidenced by the signature of the chairman thereof."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] is recognized.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, this resolution as presented is in the usual form. Though there are numerous forms that have been used in the past, I think the one that is generally adopted is the form in which this resolution is presented. The Committee on Accounts believed that it was wise, inasmuch as we were beginning a new policy, and a policy for ourselves, that the expenditures should be limited. We therefore provide by an amendment that the expenditures shall not exceed \$25,000. Now, I want to say, however, that so far as the Committee on Accounts is concerned, we have no disposition to limit any reasonable expenditure of that important special committee. If it is necessary to expend more money, there will be no hesitancy on the part of the Committee on Accounts to bring in a resolution asking for a greater authorization. In addition to that, we believed that it was wise policy to provide that the accounts as they may accrue, that the expenditures that are made by the committee, should be authorized by the committee itself, and that the Accounts Committee, which is charged with the watching and controlling of the contingent fund, should also have some control of the expenditures of that committee. So that these amendments provide that any expenditures that are made shall be authorized by both the special committee and the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. LLOYD. I will.

Mr. MANN. I notice the limitation in the first instance is \$25,000. I think the amendments, I will say to the gentleman, which the committee has proposed make a very good guard for the resolution in order to safeguard it properly. I would like to ask the gentleman whether it is anticipated that this committee is likely to expend any such sum as \$25,000? You authorize this for the sugar investigating committee, and if newspaper reports are true innumerable requests will be made for other committees. Of course, I do not know how many are likely to be appointed, but are these committees likely to expend such a sum as \$25,000?

Mr. LLOYD. I am assured by the chairman, Mr. Speaker, that the committee, so far as it now has information, thinks it will not spend as much as \$10,000 in this investigation, but no one can tell at this juncture what will be the expenditure; and I suppose that, so far as every Member of this House is concerned, if more money is needed that they may have it, in order to hold a complete and thorough investigation of the matters referred to the committee.

Mr. MANN. I certainly have no objection to letting them have a proper amount, and I feel very confident that the gentleman from Kentucky, who now rises, will not be unduly extravagant. I have no idea that that is in his mind; but, as I said before, I would like to make an inquiry as to what is the probable amount of expense connected with this investigation.

Mr. STANLEY. I would like to say to the gentleman from Illinois that it is impossible at this time to tell what will be the necessary expenses connected with this investigation, be-

cause we can not tell at this time the full scope of the inquiry. We propose to make a careful and diligent and thorough investigation, as outlined in the resolution. It might occur that in making that investigation the services of experts and other items of expense would be found necessary. For instance, if the United States Steel Corporation should be unwilling or reluctant to give us the facts to which we think we are entitled, or if we should not be satisfied with their report and should require the services of expert accountants and people of that kind to ascertain the data that we might think necessary in such an investigation as would be satisfactory to the American people, some considerable expense might be entailed. But, as at present outlined, I do not believe this investigation will be expensive.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman from Missouri will yield, I will say that I was chairman of an investigating committee of this House that carried on a rather prolonged investigation as to wood pulp and paper and took thousands of pages of testimony—an investigation that went very carefully into the accounts of a great many manufacturing concerns—and my recollection is that the entire expense of that investigation was less than \$5,000. I am inclined to think it did not exceed one-half of that.

Mr. STANLEY. It may be that this investigation will not exceed one-half of that. This resolution does not provide that the \$25,000 must be expended.

Mr. MANN. I understand.

Mr. STANLEY. The business of the United States Steel Corporation is an epitome of the industry of this whole country. It is interwoven with the railroads and banks and cement companies and with contracts with and for the Government. It entails an investigation into a multiplicity of subjects, and the Committee on Accounts for that reason has wisely given to this investigating committee a broad discretion, which I can assure the gentleman will not be abused.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, if no one wishes that I yield to him, I now move the previous question on the resolution and amendments to their passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] moves the previous question on the resolution and amendments thereto.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is now on agreeing to the amendments. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, they will be considered in gross.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The question was taken, and the resolution as amended was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. LLOYD, a motion to reconsider the resolution just passed, and the joint resolution passed immediately preceding it, was laid on the table.

#### ADJOURNMENT OVER.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Tuesday next.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Tuesday next is Memorial Day, and it happens to be my wedding anniversary day. [Applause.] I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Alabama whether by adjourning to meet on Tuesday it is the intention to transact any business on Tuesday?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that it is not the intention to transact any business on Tuesday. I know it is the desire of a great many Members of the House to leave here in order to make Memorial Day speeches, and there will be very few Members present here, and I want to make an arrangement by which nothing will be done on Tuesday except to adjourn over until the following Friday.

Now, the reason I want to adjourn over until Tuesday is not to escape business to be transacted on Monday. Next Monday is the fifth Monday in the month, and therefore not a Calendar Monday anyhow. But a Democratic caucus has been called to consider the wool schedule of the Ways and Means Committee on Thursday, and I want to have the meeting convene at noon instead of at night. I am in hopes of being able to report the wool bill on Friday, provided the caucus agrees to the bill, and to present it to the full committee on Saturday, so that we may be able to take it up early the following week. For that reason I desire that the House adjourn until Tuesday. I will say to the gentleman that if agreeable to both sides we shall not transact any business on Tuesday except to adjourn over until Friday.



The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet next Tuesday. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet Tuesday, May 30, 1911, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. PADGETT, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9442) to amend an act approved March 4, 1911, entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, and for other purposes," reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 39), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9930) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Townsend, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 10643) to abolish the Arkansas National Forest; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10644) appropriating \$350,000 for the construction of dredge boats for dredging on the Arkansas River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 10645) for the acquisition of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Sikeston, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10646) for the acquisition of a site and the erection of a building thereon at West Plains, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10647) to increase the limit of cost for the erection of a post-office building at Poplar Bluff, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BRANTLEY: A bill (H. R. 10648) amending an act entitled "An act to authorize the registration of trade-marks used in commerce with foreign nations or among the several States or with the Indian tribes, and to protect the same"; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 10649) to regulate the assignment of wages, salaries, and earnings in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COOPER: A bill (H. R. 10650) to establish a fish-cultural station at or near the city of Janesville, in the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 10651) for the relief of Spanish War soldiers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 10652) to authorize the counties of Yell and Conway to construct a bridge across the Petit Jean River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McHENRY: A bill (H. R. 10857) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish a condemned bronze or brass cannon or fieldpiece to Goodwich Post, No. 22, Grand Army of the Republic, Danville, Pa.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Minnesota: Resolution (H. Res. 177) asking the President of the United States for certain information relating to the wool schedule; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUBBARD: Resolution (H. Res. 178) requesting the President to furnish the House with certain information; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: Resolution (H. Res. 179) authorizing the Committee on Labor to investigate conditions existing in the Westmoreland coal fields of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PEPPER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 110) to authorize the Secretary of War to issue ordnance and ordnance stores to high schools; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROUSSARD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) to empower and instruct the Mississippi River Commission to investigate, recommend, and report as to whether or not the United States shall take charge of the levee system of the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 10653) granting an increase of pension to Daniel J. McConnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10654) granting a pension to Leonidas Orr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10655) granting an increase of pension to Algerman S. Fuller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10656) granting an increase of pension to William Goodin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10657) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Gish; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10658) to remit a judgment rendered against John G. Dorn and Thomas F. Cunningham by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 10659) granting an increase of pension to Theodore T. McKinney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BATHRICK: A bill (H. R. 10660) granting an increase of pension to Roy Goddard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 10661) granting a pension to Lee Fisher; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROUSSARD: A bill (H. R. 10662) for the relief of Glasgow C. Davis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 10663) granting an increase of pension to Conrad Hoppe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 10664) granting a pension to Claude M. Crawford; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER: A bill (H. R. 10665) granting an increase of pension to Edward Ganung; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMERON: A bill (H. R. 10666) granting an honorable discharge to Joinville Reif; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10667) granting certain lands to the town of Yuma, Ariz.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 10668) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Virden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10669) granting an increase of pension to Joseph F. Babcock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10670) granting an increase of pension to Charles Martell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10671) granting an increase of pension to Henry Counterman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10672) granting an increase of pension to Edward Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 10673) granting a pension to Marshall A. Duers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10674) granting a pension to Reuben Humbarger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 10675) granting an increase of pension to William Farrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX of Indiana (by request): A bill (H. R. 10676) for the relief of Mrs. M. B. Patterson, widow of B. F. Patterson, late United States consul general at Calcutta, India; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 10677) to correct the military record of George W. Dunning; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DENVER: A bill (H. R. 10678) granting an increase of pension to William Ellis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10679) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Stiff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10680) granting an increase of pension to William W. Britton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DONOHUE: A bill (H. R. 10681) granting an increase of pension to Richard Gennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.



Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 10682) granting a pension to Daniel Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10683) to correct the military record of Albert L. Arbaugh; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10684) to correct the military record of Richard A. Hutson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 10685) granting an increase of pension to Robert L. Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10686) granting an increase of pension to Isaac W. Waters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10687) granting an increase of pension to Aaron L. Ogden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10688) granting an increase of pension to Joseph E. Vest; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 10689) for the relief of Rebecca Walthall, widow, and the heirs of John Walthall, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10690) for the relief of the heirs of Peter Pope, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10691) for the relief of heirs of Nathaniel S. Word; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10692) for the relief of the heirs of Sarah Winter; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10693) granting a pension to Mart Bradshaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10694) granting a pension to George C. Rimes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10695) to correct the military record of Erastus Coyle; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10696) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Joseph H. Bean, administrator of estate of Joseph Bean, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 10697) granting a pension to Margaret D. Hardman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARRIS: A bill (H. R. 10698) granting a pension to Daniel K. Franklin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10699) granting a pension to Carrie C. Washburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10700) granting a pension to Lizzie M. Parsons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10701) granting a pension to Malinda Hubert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10702) granting a pension to Nellie A. Varney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10703) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Donahoe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10704) granting an increase of pension to Esteria F. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10705) granting an increase of pension to Nahum A. Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10706) granting a pension to Eva M. Jenkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 10707) granting an increase of pension to William Burgett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10708) granting an increase of pension to Daniel L. Anderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10709) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Baldwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10710) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Moloney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10711) granting an increase of pension to Harriet Ann Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEALD: A bill (H. R. 10712) naturalizing David Whitaker; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HELM: A bill (H. R. 10713) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Jacobs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 10714) granting an increase of pension to Noah Hayes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10715) granting a pension to Udora E. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10716) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Ault; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10717) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Walrath; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10718) granting an increase of pension to George W. Burton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10719) granting a pension to James H. Sykes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10720) granting a pension to William A. Pollard; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10721) granting a pension to James M. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10722) for the relief of W. H. Hicks, administrator of the estate of John Diehl, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10723) for the relief of Amasa and Edgar Bernard and the legal representatives of the estate of Susan E. White; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10724) for the relief of the estate of George Eyerly, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10725) for the relief of the heirs of Catherine Carter, deceased, and others; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10726) for the relief of the heirs of Augusta W. Diehl, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 10727) for the relief of Glasgow C. Davis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KIPP: A bill (H. R. 10728) granting an increase of pension to Phillip N. Bartlow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10729) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Archibald Nurss; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 10730) granting a pension to William Reedy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10731) granting a pension to Guilbert Allen (now Peace); to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCCREARY: A bill (H. R. 10732) for the relief of the heirs of Lucy M. Fisher, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MCKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 10733) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Bowden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10734) granting an increase of pension to Fredrick D. Fouke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10735) granting an increase of pension to Kate L. John; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10736) granting an increase of pension to Fred E. Savage; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10737) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Powers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10738) granting an increase of pension to William S. Weinhold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MALBY: A bill (H. R. 10739) granting an increase of pension to William Fogarty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10740) granting an increase of pension to Peter Brayton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10741) granting an increase of pension to Elliott A. Clarke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10742) for the relief of Lewis F. Hall; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10743) granting a pension to Florence L. Latrace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10744) granting a pension to Mary C. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10745) granting a pension to Eliza Holbrook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10746) granting a pension to Jenkin Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10747) granting an increase of pension to Nathan H. Mooney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10748) granting an increase of pension to William H. McAllister; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10749) granting an increase of pension to Robert Wilkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10750) granting an increase of pension to Jacob H. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10751) granting an increase of pension to John Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 10752) granting a pension to Sarah E. Mills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEPPER: A bill (H. R. 10753) granting an increase of pension to Frank G. Lockwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10754) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Reeves; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PLUMLEY: A bill (H. R. 10755) granting a pension to Ella A. Carlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10756) granting an increase of pension to Giles J. Burgess; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.



By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 10757) for the relief of William Wells; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10758) granting a pension to Mary Bruce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10759) granting a pension to William Roark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10760) granting a pension to Henry Marlow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10761) granting a pension to Owen A. Black; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10762) granting an increase of pension to Jane West; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10763) granting an increase of pension to John W. Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 10764) granting an increase of pension to G. W. Tracy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 10765) granting a pension to Margaret A. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 10766) granting an increase of pension to Edward Cunningham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 10767) granting an increase of pension to Henry Selover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 10768) for the relief of heirs or estate of Mrs. Eunice Hurdle, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10769) for the relief of heirs or estate of James Porter, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10770) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in case of W. T. Smith, administrator of Maria A. Reinhardt, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10771) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of John L. Woodson, administrator of Richard O. Woodson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10772) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of G. D. Able, administrator of the estate of Catherine J. Rutherford, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10773) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of J. D. Robinson, administrator of estate of Melchisedec Robinson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10774) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in case of California M. Hearn, in her own right and as administratrix of estates of Susan L. Bailey and Julia B. Hancock, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10775) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of John Fuller, administrator of J. B. Fuller, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10776) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Charles O. Spencer; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10777) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Mrs. J. H. T. Jackson, administratrix of estate of Elizabeth Hull Welford, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10778) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of J. A. Hill, administrator of estate of Benjamin Hawes, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10779) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Hardinia P. Kelsey and Mildred E. Franklin, heirs of Hardin P. Franklin, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10780) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Mrs. L. H. Rowland, administratrix of Willis J. Moran, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10781) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Charles A. Doak and John R. Doak; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10782) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Margaret Raiford Loftin, administratrix of Robert Raiford, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10783) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Minor Saunders; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 10784) for the relief of Charley Clark, a homestead settler on certain lands therein described; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 10785) granting a pension to Margaret A. Easton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10786) granting an increase of pension to William W. Parsons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRIBBLE: A bill (H. R. 10787) granting an increase of pension to William P. Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHITACRE: A bill (H. R. 10788) granting a pension to Haidee Culler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10789) granting a pension to Estella M. Manville; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10790) granting a pension to Sarah A. Mangus; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10791) granting an increase of pension to John Heltzell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10792) granting an increase of pension to Alexander T. McCord; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10793) granting an increase of pension to Elwood M. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10794) granting an honorable discharge to James H. Davis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10795) holding and considering Silas Steffy to have been honorably discharged; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 10796) granting an increase of pension to William Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10797) granting a pension to William F. Slack; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10798) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Kyle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10799) granting an increase of pension to Marion Ridgley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 10800) granting an increase of pension to Milton G. Wiggins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 10801) granting a pension to Susan Chambers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10802) granting a pension to Mile Bean; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10803) granting a pension to Sarah B. Vorhis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10804) granting a pension to T. J. Harcourt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10805) granting a pension to Catharine J. Trine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10806) granting a pension to Jackson Weathers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10807) granting a pension to Michael Luby; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10808) granting a pension to Lovina Swain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10809) granting a pension to Edward McCabe; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10810) granting a pension to Fred Hoppe; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10811) granting a pension to Julia King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10812) granting a pension to John A. Kelly; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10813) granting a pension to Mrs. C. S. Jarboe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10814) granting a pension to Payton Lacy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10815) granting an increase of pension to James L. Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10816) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10817) granting an increase of pension to William A. Hurley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10818) granting an increase of pension to Richard A. Simpson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10819) granting an increase of pension to John Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10820) granting an increase of pension to George E. Wells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10821) granting an increase of pension to James M. Love; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10822) granting an increase of pension to John G. Whitman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.



Also, a bill (H. R. 10823) granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Burleigh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10824) granting an increase of pension to John Graves; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10825) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Price; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10826) granting an increase of pension to William Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10827) granting an increase of pension to Michael Ries; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10828) granting an increase of pension to Eugene D. Lloyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10829) granting an increase of pension to William H. Bender; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10830) granting an increase of pension to Aquila T. Miles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10831) granting an increase of pension to John Webb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10832) granting an increase of pension to William Hasker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10833) granting an increase of pension to William L. Smoot; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10834) granting an increase of pension to Job Eldridge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10835) granting an increase of pension to Albert A. Ceser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10836) granting an increase of pension to William J. Light; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10837) granting an increase of pension to James Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10838) granting an increase of pension to William H. Hoyt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10839) granting an increase of pension to Tilmon Craft; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10840) granting an increase of pension to Timothy J. Golden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10841) granting an increase of pension to Josiah B. Cratty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10842) granting an increase of pension to S. N. Burdsall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10843) granting an increase of pension to James Heyburn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10844) granting a pension to Joseph W. Nichols; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10845) granting an increase of pension to Mitchell Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10846) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Peterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10847) granting an increase of pension to Adam Shade; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10848) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Aylsworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10849) granting an increase of pension to John Dauenhauer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10850) granting an increase of pension to Danforth B. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10851) granting an increase of pension to William H. Noggle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10852) granting an increase of pension to Francis Howard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10853) granting an increase of pension to John Barbeau; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10854) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Ireland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10855) granting an increase of pension to James A. Haas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10856) granting an increase of pension to Joseph D. Boyer; to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: Resolutions adopted by the Third National Peace Congress, at Baltimore, May 3-6, 1911, urging upon the United States Government the adoption of an arbitration treaty on the lines of the proposed treaty with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petition of O. T. Gillett, of Continental, Ohio, in favor of a reduction in the duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Papers to accompany House bill 10525, for the relief of Edward Steinbaugh, and House bill 6143, for

the relief of Frank O. Richards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Frank C. Rea and 6 other druggists, of New Philadelphia, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of House bill 8887, a bill putting a tax on proprietary medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, urging an amendment to the corporation-tax law whereby it shall be made permissible for corporations and companies to make returns as of the close of their fiscal years instead of December 31, as provided now by law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Carnegie Hive, Ladies of the Maccabees of the World, of Carnegie, Pa., against the Howard bill, which proposes to tax fraternal benefit societies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of the Chamber of Commerce, Allegheny Lumber Co., and the E. V. Babcock Lumber Co., of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring House joint resolution 97, providing for an investigation for the purpose of collecting statistical data relating to the loss of life and property by fire in the United States, the reasonableness of rates charged for fire insurance, and the relation of such rates to the causes of fire losses; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Conrad Hoppe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petitions of sundry citizens of Chester, Pa., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 237, entitled "An act for the proper observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia," or any like measure; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CARY: Communication from the Monarch Manufacturing Co., Milwaukee, Wis., urging the passage of the bill providing for the erection of a new post-office building at Bangor, Me.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, communication from Geuder, Paeschuke & Frey Co., Milwaukee, Wis., urging the speedy erection of a new post-office building at Bangor, Me.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CLINE: Papers accompanying pension claim of Reuben Humbarger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany pension claim of Marshall A. Duers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, protest against House bill 8887 by A. R. Otis, of Kendallville, Ind.; Fort Wayne Drug Co., of Fort Wayne, Ind.; and the Fuelling Drug Co., of Woodburn, Ind.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of D. H. Stinson against parcels-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, protests by Fort Wayne Local of Socialist Party; Friendship Lodge, No. 70, International Association of Machinists; Old Fort Lodge, No. 379, Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America; International Moulders' Union Local No. 62, all of Fort Wayne, Ind.; and Cigar Makers' Union No. 33, of Indianapolis, Ind., against the court action taken in the McNamara case; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. COOPER: Petition of the Foster Mercantile Co., of Salem, Wis., asking for a reduction in the duties on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COX of Indiana: Petitions of sundry citizens of Jeffersonville, Ind., asking for lower duties on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition in favor of resolution asking for investigation of kidnapping of John J. McNamara; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FARR: Petitions of William Farrell and four others, of Scranton, Pa., asking for a reduction in the import duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRENCH: Petitions from citizens of Kendrick, Juliaetta, Orofino, Ilo, Cottonwood, Leland, Southwick, Cameron, Reubens, Gifford, Chesley, Russell, Morton, Genesee, Nez Perce, Korsler, Post Falls, Rathdrum, Gilbert, Peck, and Melrose, Idaho, protesting against the passage of the Canadian reciprocity treaty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of a firm at Ferdinand, Idaho, asking for reduction in duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: Petitions of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, protesting against the establishment of a Federal bureau or department of health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.



Also, resolutions adopted by Massachusetts State Board of the Ancient Order of Hibernians of America, protesting against the adoption of the proposed peace treaty between the United States and certain foreign countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution adopted by the First Parish in Hingham, Mass., favoring the adoption of the proposed arbitration treaty between the United States and England; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia: Petition of sundry druggists of Charleston, W. Va., protesting against House bill SSS7; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Socialists and labor sympathizers, protesting against kidnaping of J. J. McNamara; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HEALD: Petitions of sundry citizens of the sixth, tenth, and twelfth wards of the city of Wilmington, Del., protesting against the proposed arbitration treaty with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HELM: Papers to accompany House bill 9619, granting a pension to John Middleton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: Papers to accompany House bill 10727 for the relief of Glasgow C. Davis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Petitions of W. H. Andrews, of Chanceford, Pa., and George W. Devillbiss, of Stewartstown, Pa., praying for the reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McHENRY: Petition of Camp No. 364, Patriotic Order Sons of America, Danville, Pa., urging immediate action by Congress of illiteracy test; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Camp No. 684, Patriotic Order Sons of America, Mifflinville, Pa., urging upon Congress the immediate enactment of the illiteracy test into law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Sarah E. Mills, widow of Samuel W. Maroon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: Petitions of sundry citizens of Arkansas, asking for a reduction in the duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAKER: Resolutions by the Los Angeles (Cal.) Chamber of Commerce, urging the fortification of Los Angeles Harbor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SCULLY: Resolution adopted by National Association of Shellfish Commissioners at Baltimore, Md., April 19, 1911, urging conservation of marine and inland fisheries; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of citizens of New Jersey, protesting against the proposed new arbitration treaty with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Carded Woolen Manufacturers' Association, protesting against a specific duty on wool; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Petitions of citizens of Bexar and Brown Counties, Tex., praying for a reduction in the duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: Papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Edward Cunningham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: Petition of the Columbus Chamber of Commerce, of Columbus, Ohio, for an amendment to the corporation-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE: Papers to accompany House bill 10631; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 10633; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 10630; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 10632; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of Central Labor Union of Brooklyn, N. Y., in favor of the House resolution introduced by Mr. BERGER, calling for an investigation of the kidnaping of the secretary-treasurer of the Structural Iron Workers' National Union; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of United American and United Irish-American Societies of New York, protesting against proposed new arbitration treaty with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## SENATE.

MONDAY, May 29, 1911.

The Senate met at 2 o'clock p. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday last was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 75) reducing the number of Capitol police, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented resolutions adopted by the National Machine Tool Builders' Association, in convention assembled, favoring the extension of the merchant marine service, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the committee of law and legislation of the Chamber of Commerce of Washington, D. C., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Johnston Sunday rest bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the East Washington Citizens' Association, favoring the consideration and recommendation of all appropriations for the District of Columbia by the District of Columbia Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, which were referred to the Committee on Rules.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Danbury, Conn., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GALLINGER presented resolutions adopted by the East Washington Citizens' Association of the District of Columbia, favoring a change in the rules of the Senate so as to authorize the Committees on the District of Columbia of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, to consider and recommend all appropriations for the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on Rules.

He also presented a petition of the committee on law and legislation of the Chamber of Commerce of Washington, D. C., praying for the establishment of an inebriate hospital in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CULLOM presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Martinsville, Ill., remonstrating against the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Lake County Druggists' Association of Illinois, and a memorial of the Rock Island County Retailers' Association of Illinois, remonstrating against the imposition of a stamp tax on proprietary medicines, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Boulder, Colo., and a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Salida, Colo., praying for the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of South Fork and New Brunswick, in the State of New Jersey; and of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Manchester, N. H., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I present a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, which I ask may be printed in the Record and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATE OF UTAH,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Charles S. Tingey, secretary of state of the State of Utah, do hereby certify that the following is a full, true, and correct copy of house joint memorial No. 2, petitioning the United States Government to improve a certain part of the Fort Douglas Military Reservation, as appears on file in my office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Utah this 25th day of May, A. D. 1911.

[SEAL.]

C. S. TINGEY, Secretary of State.  
By H. L. CUMMINGS, Deputy.